DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 603 CS 505 191

AUTHOR McCroskey, James C.; McCroskey, Linda L.
TITLE The Affinity-Seeking of Classroom Teachers.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (71st, Denver, CO, November 7-10, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Nonverbal Communication; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Affinity Seeking Strategies

ABSTRACT

A study explored the extent to which affinity-seeking strategies are used in elementary and secondary school classrooms. Subjects, 311 elementary and secondary school teachers enrolled in classes related to communication instruction, completed a measurement instrument designed to evaluate their use of affinity-seeking strategies. Analysis of the data revealed that when teachers seek increased affinity with students they frequently use such strategies as physical attractiveness, sensitivity, and dynamism. However, such strategies as reward association, self-inclusion, similarity, openness, supportiveness, and conceding control were not often used. Teachers in the lower grades tended to use sensitivity, dynamism, and nonverbal immediacy more often than teachers in upper grades, while presenting interesting self and personal autonomy were used more frequently in the upper grades. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265603

THE AFFINITY-SEEKING OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

James C. McCroskey and Linda L. McCroskey

West Virginia University

Abstract

Drawing upon the work of Bell and Daly (1984) in interpersonal contexts, affinity-seeking of classroom teachers was examined. Based upon data supplied by 311 elementary and secondary teachers, it was concluded that the strategies most commonly used by such teachers when seeking increased affinity with students are Physical Attractiveness, Sensitivity, Elicit Others' Disclosures, Trustworthiness, Nonverbal Immediacy, Conversational Role-Taking, Dynamism, and Listening. In contrast such teachers report little use of Inclusion of Other, Self-Inclusion, Reward Association, Coercive Control, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Similarity, Openness, Present Interesting Self, and Supportiveness. Several meaningful differences were observed as a function of level of instruction. These results are interpreted within the framework of task relationships involving status differential. Directions for future research in this area are outlined.

Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Colorado, November, 1985.

S 005 191

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. C. McCroskey
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE AFFINITY-SEEKING OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Effective classroom teaching depends upon effective communication between teacher and student. In fact, it has been suggested that the critical difference between knowing and teaching is communication in the classroom (Hurt, Scott, & McCroskey, 1978).

Although teachers may present material to many students at the same time, students learn individually. Thus, a teacher forms an interpersonal relationship with each student. Consequently, teaching must be viewed as an interpersonal communication process. Research in the area of interpersonal communication has consistently demonstrated that people who like each other communicate more effectively in interpersonal relationships. Liking increases the probability of interpersonal influence and reduces the probability of interpersonal conflict (McCroskey, Richmond, and Stewart, 1986).

In the classroom environment, teachers regularly need to influence students to engage in on-task learning behaviors (Emmer & Evertson, 1981; McGarity & Butts, 1984). Time spent directly on leaning tasks has been found to be a major predictor of student cognitive learning (Denham & Lieberman, 1980; McGarity and Butts, 1984; Rosenshine, 1979; Samuels & Turnure; Woolfolk & McCune-Nicolich, 1984). Student resistence to teacher influence to engage in on-task behavior is not only disruptive of the classroom but also leads directly to reduced student cognitive learning. To the extent that a student has higher affinity for her/his teacher he/she is more likely to accept the teacher's influence and more likely to increase time spent on learning tasks. The probable effect of increased affinity between student and teacher, then, is increased cognitive learning on the part of the student.

A second effect of increased affinity between student and teacher is a reduction in the potential for interpersonal conflict. Such conflict is a major barrier to affective learning in the classroom. Affective learning, the development of positive affective orientations toward the subject matter taught and the behaviors recommend in the course, hinges in large part upon a positive relationship between student and teacher. Student-teacher conflict undercuts the very foundation of such a relationship. While student's can develop positive orientations toward a subject matter in spite of a negative relationship with the teacher, such an outcome is much more the exception than the rule. Thus, a second effect of increased affinity between student and teacher is increased affective learning on the part of the student.

Affinity-Seeking Strategies

Considerable research in the fields of communication and psychology has focused on relatively static elements which enhance affinity between people. Most of this research has centered on such things as physical attractiveness and similarity or homophily. That people like others who are physically attractive and/or similar to themselves has been well established. Knowing this, however, provides a teacher with little guidance for behavior, save knowing that one should try to improve one's appearance and highlight one's similarities while interacting with others.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As Bell and Daly (1984) note, a second--but much less common--approach in research on the enhancement of affinity between people has focused on social competence and social skills (eg. Argyle, 1972; McCroskey & Wheeless, 1976). This approach seeks to determine what people need to know (competence) and what they need to do (skill) to enhance affinity with others. In an initial effort to provide a typology of methods by which people may enhance affinity with others, McCroskey and Wheeless (1976) provided seven categories: control physical appearance, increase positive self-disclosure, stress areas of positive similarity, provide positive reinforcement, express cooperation, comply with the other person's wishes, and fulfill the other person's needs.

In keeping with this approach, Bell and Daly (1984) developed a typology of affinity-seeking strategies thought to generalize across a variety of communication contexts. In developing the categories for their typology, Bell and Daly (1984) drew upon information generated by small brainstorming groups who were asked to "produce a list of things people can say or do to get others to like them" (p.96). The majority of these groups were composed of classroom teachers, the remainder undergraduate students. In the development of the categories of the typology, Bell and Daly (1984) took care to insure that each category was communicative in nature, that is the "category had to refer to messages and/or alterations of a person's self-presentation for the purpose of achieving liking of another" (p. 96).

Bell and Daly (1984) report a series of studies which investigated the typology of affinity-seeking strategies, the impact of strategy use, personality and situational factors which influence their use, and the dimensionality of the typology. They summarize their primary findings as follows:

> First, the 25-strategy typology developed to address the preliminary question operationalized the affinity-seeking construct thoroughly and reliably. Second, people who were thought to use many affinity-seeking strategies were judged likable, socially successful, and satisfied with their lives. Third, personality and situational features influence both the number of strategies a person produces and the self-reported likelihood of using each strategy. Fourth, at least three dimensions underlie the affinity-seeking construct... (p. 111)

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The work of Bell and Daly (1984) shows considerable promise for generating insight into how affinity can be altered through communicative behavior in a variety of types of communicative relationships. Our concern in the present investigation was the use of affinity-seeking strategies in teacher-student relationships. Since the typology generated by Bell and Daly was based in large part on data drawn from classroom teachers, the likelihood that it would apply to student-teacher relationships, as well as other interpersonal relationships, seems strong.

Our first concern was with the relative usefullness of the individual strategy categories in the typology in this relational context. Bell and Daly (1984) found that both context and status impacted subjects' choices of stragegies for use. Teacher-student communication involves a superior-subordinate status relationship. The context of the classroom, in addition, is quite unlike many other communicative contexts. Consequently, our first two

research questions were:

RQ_1 To what extent is each of the affinity-seeking strategies used in elementary and secondary schools?

RQ_2 How frequently is each of the categories of affinity-seeking strategies used by teachers in elementary and secondary schools?

Although the classroom may be thought of as a context distinguishable from such other contexts as the factory, the office, roommates, and the romantic relationship, not all classrooms are alike. While there are many dimensions upon which classrooms could be sorted, the one which we felt was most important, particularly in the early stages of this research, was the grade level taught. Thus, our third research question was:

RQ_3 Does affinity-seeking strategy use vary as a function of level of instruction?

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 311 elementary and secondary school teachers enrolled in classes related to communication in instruction. There were 246 females and 65 males. One hundred twenty-seven reported having taught five years or less, 89 between six and ten years, 67 between 10 and 15 years, and 28 over 15 years. With regard to teaching level, 74 taught in grades K-3, 44 grades 4-6, 45 grades 7-9, 51 grades 10-12, and 97 who taught across grades levels (music teachers, reading specialists, librarians, physical education teachers, art teachers, speech pathologists, etc.).

Measurement

The measuring instrument for this study was based on the typology of affinity-seeking strategies reported by Bell and Daly (1984). The labels for the strategies were not presented to the subjects. The descriptions of the strategies reported by Bell and Daly (1984, pp. 96-97) were rewritten to be consistent with the teacher-student relationship context. The descriptions employed are reported in Table 1.

Subjects were asked to read each strategy description and then

> (1) indicate by circling YES or NO whether you have observed other teachers in your school using the strategy and, (2) indicate how often you have observed other teachers in your school using the same strategy by circling one of the following:
> Rarely = 1; Occasionally = 2; Often = 3; or Very Often = 4

When subjects indicated they had not seen the strategy used by other teachers in their school, the frequency of use score (response 2) was set at zero.

Subjects were asked to reference use by other teachers rather than by themselves in order to reduce social desirability of the responses. As a result, the frequency of Yes-No responses presumably provides an indication of the

proportion of schools in which a given strategy is used but may not indicate the proportion of teachers who use the strategy.

In order to sort subjects by grade level taught, the instrument also asked the respondent to indicate the grade level(s) at which he/she taught. The subjects were also asked to indicate their gender and the number of years they had been teaching.

Data Analyses

In order to analyze data pertaining to our first research question, frequency analyses were performed on responses to the question of whether the subjects had observed each strategy being used in their school. Mean scores for frequency of observed use across all subjects were generated for each strategy in order to analyze data pertaining to our second research question.

In order to determine whether strategy use varies as a function of level of instruction (our third research question), chi-square analyses were performed on the Yes-No responses by level taught (K-3; 4-6; 7-9; 10-12) for each strategy. Similarly, a multivariate analysis of variance followed by one-way analyses of variance with level taught as the independent variable were computed on the scores for frequency of observed use for each strategy. In addition, a general affinity-seeking score was computed by summing the scores for the individual strategies (Alpha reliability = .77). These scores were submitted to one-way analysis of variance with level taught as the independent variable.

Although we posed no research questions concerning the impact of gender or teaching experience on strategy use, supplementary analyses were conducted to examine their possible effects. A series of one-way analyses of variance of mean strategy use was conducted with gender and teaching experience (see above classifications) alternatingly serving as the independent variable. Where significant effects were obtained, these analyses were followed by sequential analyses of variance which removed the variance attributable to level taught to determine whether any variance which could be attributed to gender or experience was redundant with that attributable to teaching level.

RESULTS

Table 2 reports the mean frequency of use for each affinity-seeking strategy and the percentage of respondents reporting they had observed the strategy used by teachers in their school. The strategies are ordered by mean frequency of use.

Since the scale on frequency of use ranged from 0 to 4, high use was defined as 2.5 or higher (midway between "often" and "very often") and low use was defined as below 1.5 (midway between "rarely" and "occasionally"). Employing this operationalization, the eight strategies which were found to be most highly used were Physical Attractiveness, Sensitivity, Elicit Other's Disclosure, Trustworthiness, Nonverbal Immediacy, Conversational Rule-Keeping, Dynamism, and Listening. In addition to the high mean frequency of use scores received by these strategies, each was also perceived as being used in the school by over 90 percent of the respondents.

The nine strategies which were seen as having comparatively low use were:

Inclusion of Other, Self-Inclusion, Reward Association, Conceed Control, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Similarity, Openness, Present Interesting Self, and Supportiveness. However, only three of these (Inclusion of Other, Self-Inclusion, and Reward Association) were perceived as being used in the school by less than half of the respondents.

The chi-square analyses of perceived use by level of instruction indicated significant effects for only three strategies--Personal Autonomy, Reward Association, and Similarity. As noted in Table 3, all three of these were seen as used in their schools by more teachers in the upper grade levels than by those in the lower grade levels.

The analysis of variance of the general affinity-seeking scores by grade level yielded a non-significant result ($F = 2.16$, $p > .05$). However, the multivariate analysis of variance indicated a significant difference in strategy use as a function of level of instruction (Pillai's Trace, $F = 1.58$, $p < .01$, $V = .52$). These results indicate that affinity-seeking strategy use is impacted by level of instruction not on the basis of total use but on the basis of differential use. That is, teachers at the various levels appear not to differ in their amount of affinity-seeking behavior, but teachers at different levels emphasize different strategies.

The results of the univariate analyses of variance by level of instruction support the above interpretation. Table 4 reports the mean use scores by grade level for each strategy which yielded an F-ratio which was significant at at least the .10 alpha level. As indicated in that table, 7 strategies yielded significance at the .05 level and an additional 5 strategies were significant between .05 and .10. Because of the exploratory nature of this study, the latter results are reported. However, these marginally significant findings should be interpreted with caution.

An examination of these results suggests that teachers in grades 4-6 tend to use more Altruism and Conceed Control and less Assume Control than teachers at other levels. Teachers at lower grade levels tend to use more Dynamism, Elicit Other's Disclosure, Listening, Nonverbal Immediacy, Physical Attractiveness, and Sensitivity than teachers at upper grade levels. In contrast, teachers at upper grade levels tend to use more Personal Autonomy, Present Interesting Self, and Similarity than do teachers at lower grade levels.

The supplementary analyses of the relationship between teaching experience and strategy use yielded no significant results. Those for the impact of gender yielded several significant relationships. However, when the effect attributable to level of instruction was removed, all gender effects were non-significant. It appears that the observed gender effects can be explained by the fact that a disproportionately high percentage of the elementary teachers in the study were female, a characteristic which is also true of the population of elementary teachers in this country.

Although we posed no research question concerning the use of affinity-seeking strategies by teachers with students compared to their use by others in other contexts, the availability of the data reported by Bell and Daly (1984) made it possible to draw such a comparison. In their study they obtained data on college student preferences of use of the various affinity-seeking strategies in differing contexts and with differing status levels of interactants. By

collapsing across these context and status levels, Bell and Daly (1984) obtained a general score for each strategy for its liklihood of use. Rankings for the strategies based on these data are reported in Table 2, as are the rankings based on the data from the present study.

A Spearman rho was computed for the correlation between the rankings from the two studies. A rho = .80 was obtained ($t = 6.39$, $p < .001$). Three of the strategies appeared to produce most of the variation between the ranks in the two studies--Optimism, Assume Control, and Inclusion of Other. Optimism and Inclusion of Other were ranked much higher in the previous study, Assume Control much lower. After excluding these three strategies, a rho = .87 was obtained ($t = 7.94$, $p < .001$).

DISCUSSION

The results of this investigation generally indicated that teacher use of affinity-seeking strategies with students may not differ greatly from the use of those strategies by college students across a variety of contexts. The high rank-order correlation obtained suggests the possiblity that a general heirarchy of strategy use may exist across communicators and communication contexts. This does not, however, mean that important differences do not exist between contexts or communicators, nor does it suggest that any given strategy is equally effective in different contexts.

In the Bell and Daly (1984) study it was found that Conceed Control, Assume Equality, and Inclusion of Other were more likely to be used in social than in task contexts. In the present task context, Conceed Control and Inclusion of Other were reportedly used comparatively little and Assume Equality only occasionally. However, Bell and Daly (1984) found that Openness and Dynamism were more likely to be used in task than in social contexts. In the present study, Dynamisim was also found to receive comparatively high use, but Openness was reported to be used only rarely.

Given the classroom context, it would seem that use of Dynamism would be appropriate. Dynamism should help keep students' attention and interest as well as increase affinity. In contrast, Conceed Control, Assume Equality, Inclusion of Other, and Openness would appear to have potential for generating negative impact as well as the potential positive impact of greater affinity. Teachers must maintain control in most instances, they are not equal to their students. Including students in teachers' social activities may be very inappropriate, and engaging in open self-disclosure may breach the needed professional distance between the teacher and the student. While all of these strategies may be more appropriate at the college level of instruction, at the levels of instruction examined in the present investigation they generally are not.

With regard to the impact of status on strategy use, Bell and Daly (1984) found that people in a lower status role were more likely to use Conversational Rule-Keeping and Conceed Control than were people in a same-status role. In the present study, our higher-status subjects made little use of Conceed Control but reported comparatively high use of Conversational Rule-Keeping. The contrasting Conceed Control results suggest a complimentary relationship in interactions between people of unequal status, which seems very reasonable. However, the high frequency of use of Conversational Rule-Keeping by both higher and lower status individuals implies a norm for interactents with differing status levels that is

stronger than that for individuals in same-status interactions.

Bell and Daly (1984) found 13 strategies were less likely to be used by individuals in a lower status role than those in a same-status interaction. Five of these were found in this study unlikely to be used by a person in a higher status role also: Openness, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Reward Association, Self-Inclusion, and Inclusion of Other. Two, however, were found to be highly likely to be used: Sensitivity and Elicit Other's Disclosures.

On balance, the results of this and the previous study suggest that status in a relationship may have an extremely strong impact on interactants' choices of affinity-seeking strategies. Some may be effective for superiors (or subordinates) in one context but not in another. Similarly, some may be effective for superiors but not for subordinates, or vice versa. Clearly, future research in affinity-seeking should take into account status in communicative relationships.

In the present study, our teacher subjects provided clear indications that some affinity-seeking strategies are more commonly employed in schools than others. Across the various levels of instruction in elementary and secondary schools, several strategies were reported to be commonly employed, namely Physical Attractiveness, Sensitivity, Elicit Other's Disclosures, Trustworthiness, Nonverbal Immediacy, Conversational Rule-Keeping, Dynamism, and Listening. In contrast, several were reported to be used comparatively little, namely Supportiveness, Present Interesting Self, Openness, Similarity, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Concede Control, Reward Association, Self-Inclusion, and Inclusion of Other.

Level of instruction was also found to impact the reported use of strategies. Three very commonly used strategies, Sensitivity, Dynamism, and Nonverbal Immediacy, were reported to be more heavily used in the lower grades. In contrast, two less used strategies, Present Interesting Self and Personal Autonomy, were reported to be more heavily used in the upper grades. Conceed Control and Altruism were reportedly used more by teachers in grades 4-6 than teachers at other levels, but neither was highly used at any level.

Why these differences as a function of instructional level were found to exist cannot be determined with the current data. However, all seem to be consistent with the developmental levels of the children involved. We may speculate that if we were to compare strategy use of college teachers with that of the teachers in the present study we would find even more differences as a function of level of instruction. College teachers report much less need for attention to maintenance of control than do teachers at lower levels of instruction (Downs, Plax, Kearney & Stewart, 1985). This may provide such teachers with much more flexibility in choice of affinity-seeking strategies than is avaiable to their colleagues teaching at lower levels. Similarly, teachers working with adults, at college or pre-college levels, may exist in a context very different from that of other teachers. In particular, the status differential between these teachers and their students may be much smaller in many cases. Thus, the strategies such teachers might select for use could resemble those Bell and Daly (1984) found for same-status interactants more than the strategies reported by teachers in the current study.

While the results generated by the current study provide us with our first insight into the use of affinity-seeking strategies by teachers, they raise more

questions than they answer. In addition to the need for data relating to the use of affinity-seeking strategies by college and adult education teachers, it is critical that future research examine the actual effectiveness of the various strategies in accomplishing their primary purpose--increasing student affinity with the teacher. Ultimately, we need to determine the relationship of the use of these strategies with actual student learning, particularly affective learning, but to a lesser extent cognitive learning as well. If we find that the strategies do lead to increased student-teacher affinity but do not go on to impact student learning, we may confront the difficult decision as to whether use of such techniques, much less research on and instruction about them, is worth the effort involved.

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. (1972). The psychology of interpersonal behavior (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bell, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. Communication Monographs, 51, 91-115.

Denham, C., & Lieberman, A. (1980). Time to learn. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education.

Downs, T. M., Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., & Stewart, R. A. (May, 1985). College student resistance toward teachers' use of selective control strategies. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Eastern Communication Association, Providence, RI.

Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 38, 342-347.

Hurt, H. T., Scott, M. D., & McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Communication in the classroom. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Stewart, R. A. (1986). One on one: The foundations of interpersonal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J. C., & Wheeless, L. R. (1976). An introduction to human communication. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

McCarity, J. R., Jr., & Butts, D. P. (1984). The relationship among teacher classroom management behavior, student engagement, and student achievement of middle and high school science students of varying aptitude. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21, 55-61.

Rosenshine, B. V. (1979). Content, time and direct instruction. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications. Berkely, CA: McCutchan.

Samuels, S. J., & Turnure, J. E. (1974). Attention and reading achievement in first grade boys and girls. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 29-32.

Woolfolk, A. E., & McCune-Nicolich, L. (1984). Educational psychology for teachers (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Table 1
Descriptions of Affinity-Seeking Strategies

Altruism	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her tries to be of help and assistance to the student in whatever he/she is currently doing. For example, the person holds the door for the student, assists him/her with his studies, helps him/her get the needed materials for assignments, and helps run errrands for the student. The teacher also gives advice when it is requested.
Assume Control	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as a leader, a person who has control over his/her classroom. For example, he/she directs the conversations held by students, takes charge of the classroom activities the two engage in, and mentions examples of where he/she has taken charge or served as a leader in the past.
Assume Equality	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as an equal of the other person. For example, he/she avoids appearing superior or snobbish, and does not play "one-upmanship" games.
Comfortable Self	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her acts comfortable in the setting the two find themselves, comfortable with him/herself, and comfortable with the student. He/she is relaxed, at ease, casual, and content. Distractions and disturbances in the environment are ignored. The teacher tries to look as if he/she is having a good time, even if he/she is not. The teacher gives the impression that "nothing bothers him/her."
Conceed Control	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her allows the student to control the relationship and situations surrounding the two. For example, he/she lets the student take charge of conversations and so on. The teacher attempting to be liked also lets the student influence his/her actions by not acting dominant.
Conversational Rule-Keeping	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her follows closely the culture's rules for how people socialize with others by demonstrating cooperation, friendliness, and politeness. The teacher works hard at giving relevant answers to questions, saying the right thing, acting interested and involved in conversation, and adapting his/her messages to the particular student or situation. They avoid changing the topic too soon, interrupting the student, dominating classroom discussions, and excessive self-references. The teacher using this strategy tries to avoid topics that are not of common interests to his/her students.
Dynamism	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents him/herself as a dynamic, active, and enthusiastic person. For example, they act physically animated and very lively while talking with the student, vary intonation and other vocal characteristics, and is outgoing and extroverted with the students.

Elicit Other's Disclosure — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her encourages the student to talk by asking questions and reinforcing the student for talking. For example, they inquire about the student's interests, feelings, opinion, views, and so on. They respond as if these are important and interesting, and continues to ask more questions of the student.

Facilitate Enjoyment — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her seeks to make the situations in which the two are involved very enjoyable experiences. The teacher does things the students will enjoy, is entertaining, tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics, says funny things, and tries to make the classroom conducive to enjoyment.

Inclusion of Others — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her includes the student in his/her social activities and groups of friends. They introduce the student to his/her friends, and make the student feel like "one of the group."

Influence Perceptions of Closeness — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her engages in behaviors that lead the student to perceive the relationship as being closer and more established than it has actually been. For example, she/he uses nicknames of the students, talks about "we", rather than "I" or "you". They also discuss any prior activities that included both of them.

Listening — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her pays close attention to what the student says, listening very actively. They focus attention solely on the student, paying strict attention to what is said. Moreover, the teacher attempting to be liked demonstrates that he/she listens by being responsive to the student's ideas, asking for clarification of ambiguities, being open-minded, and remembering things the student says.

Nonverbal Immediacy — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her signals interest and liking through various nonverbal cues. For example, the teacher frequently makes eye contact, stands or sits close to the student, smiles, leans toward the student, frequent head nods, and directs much gaze toward the student. All of the above indicate the teacher is very much interested in the student and what he/she has to say.

Openness — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her is open. They disclose information about his/her background, interests, and views. They may even disclose very personal information about his/her insecurities, weaknesses, and fears to make the student feel very special and trusted. (e.g. "just between you and me")

Optimism — The teacher attemtping to get a student to like him/her presents self as a positive person--an optimist--so that she/he will appear to be a person who is pleasant to be around. They act in a "happy-go-lucky" manner, are cheerful, and look on the postive side of things. They avoid complaining about things, talking about depressing topics, and being critical of self and others.

Personal Autonomy — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as an independent, free-thinking person--the kind of person who stands on their own, speaks their mind regardless of the consequences, refuses to change their behavior to meet the expectation of others, and knows where he/she is going in life. For instance, if the teacher finds he/she disagrees with the student on some issue, the teacher states his/her opinion anyway, and is confident that his/her view is right, and may even try to change the mind of the student.

Physical Attractiveness — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her tries to look as attractive as possible in appearance and attire. They wear nice clothes, practices good grooming, shows concern for proper hygiene, stands up straight, and monitors their appearance.

Present Interesting Self — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self to be a person who would be interesting to know. For example, he/she highlights past accomplishments and positive qualities, emphasizes things that make him/her especially interesting, expresses unique ideas, and demonstrates intelligence and knowledge. The teacher may discretely drop the names of of impressive people he/she knows. They may even do outlandish things to appear unpredictable, wild, or crazy.

Reward Association — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as an important figure who can reward the student for associating with him or her. For instance, he/she offers to do favors for the other, and gives the students information that would valuable. The teacher's basic message to the student is "if you like me, you will gain something."

Self-Concept Confirmation — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her demonstrates respect for the student, helps the student feel good about how they view themselves. For example, the teacher treats the student like a very important person, compliments the student, says only positive things about the student, and treats the things the student says as being very important information. They may also tell other teachers about what a great student the individual is, in hopes that the comment will get back to the student through third parties.

Self-Inclusion — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her sets up frequent encounters with the student. For example, the teacher will initiate casual encounters with the student, attempt to schedule future encounters, tries to be physically close to the student, and puts him/herself in a position to be invited to participate in the student's social activities.

Sensitivity — The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her acts in a warm, empathic manner toward the student to communicate caring and concern. They also show sympathy to the student's problems and anxieties, spend time working at understanding how the student sees their life, and accepts what the student says as an honest response. The message is "I care about you as a person."

Similarity	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her tries to make the student feel that the two of them are similar in attitudes, values, interests, preferences, personality, and so on. They express views that are similar to the views of the student, agrees with some things the student says, and points out the areas that the two have in common. Moreover, the teacher deliberately avoids engaging in behaviors that would suggest differences between the two.
Supportiveness	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her is supportive of the student and the student's positions by being encouraging, agreeable, and reinforcing to the student. The teacher also avoids criticizing the student or saying anything that might hurt the student's feelings, and sides with the student in disagreements they have with others.
Trustworthiness	The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as trustworthy and reliable. For example, he/she emphasizes his/her responsibility, reliability, fairness, dedication, honesty, and sincerity. They also maintain consistency among their stated beliefs and behaviors, fulfill any commitments made to the student, and avoids "false fronts" by acting natural at all times.

Table 2

Mean Frequency of Use, Percentage of Respondents Observing Use, and Rank Order of Affinity-Seeking Strategies

Strategy Category	Mean Use	Standard Deviation	Percentage Observing	Rank Bell & Daly*	Rank Present Study
Physical Attractiveness	3.1	1.0	97	3	1
Sensitivity	3.0	.8	99	6	2
Elicit Other's Disclosures	2.8	.9	99	8	3.5
Trustworthiness	2.8	.9	98	2	3.5
Nonverbal Immediacy	2.7	1.0	93	7	5
Conversational Rule-Keeping	2.5	1.1	93	5	7
Dynamism	2.5	1.0	94	11.5	7
Listening	2.5	.9	96	4	7
Facilitate Enjoyment	2.4	1.0	97	13	9
Optimism	2.2	1.1	87	1	10
Self-Concept Confirmation	2.1	1.2	86	10	11
Assume Control	2.0	1.2	79	22	12.5
Comfortable Self	2.0	1.1	83	9	12.5
Assume Equality	1.9	1.2	77	16	14.5
Altruism	1.9	1.2	79	14	14.5
Personal Autonomy	1.5	1.2	73	21	16
Supportiveness	1.3	1.2	67	11.5	17
Present Interesting Self	1.2	1.1	58	18	18
Openness	1.0	1.0	56	23	19.5
Similarity	1.0	1.1	55	17	19.5
Influence Perceptions of Closeness	.9	1.0	55	24	21
Concede Control	.8	1.0	51	19	22
Reward Association	.7	1.0	41	25	23
Self-Inclusion	.5	.9	35	20	24
Inclusion of Other	.4	.8	28	15	25

* Data drawn from Bell & Daly (1984) marginals reported on pp. 106-107.

Table 3
Percentage of Teachers Reporting Strategy Use By Instructional Level

	Instructional Level				
Strategy	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Chi-square
Personal Autonomy	68	57	80	88	14.04*
Reward Association	34	25	51	55	12.15*
Similarity	41	55	60	71	11.69*

* $p < .05$.

Table 4
Mean Frequency of Use By Instructional Level

	Instructional Level					
Strategy	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	F-Ratio	Omega^2
Altruism	1.9_{a}	2.3_{abc}	1.7_{b}	1.7_{c}	3.04**	.04
Assume Control	2.1_{a}	1.5_{abc}	2.0_{b}	2.0_{c}	2.42*	.03
Conceed Control	$.6_{a}$	1.2_{a}	.9	.9	3.65**	.05
Dynamism	2.7_{a}	2.7_{b}	2.5	2.2_{ab}	3.04**	.04
Elicit Other's Disclosures	2.9_{a}	3.0_{b}	2.7	2.6_{ab}	2.31*	.03
Listening	2.7_{ab}	2.7_{cd}	2.4_{ac}	2.4_{bd}	2.38*	.03
Nonverbal Immediacy	2.9_{a}	2.7	2.6	2.3_{a}	3.22**	.04
Personal Autonomy	1.4_{a}	1.2_{b}	1.6	1.9_{ab}	3.50**	.05
Physical Attractiveness	3.4_{a}	3.3	3.1	3.0_{a}	2.43*	.03
Present Interesting Self	$.8_{ab}$	1.0	1.4_{a}	1.4_{b}	4.17**	.06
Sensitivity	3.3_{ab}	3.3_{cd}	2.9_{ac}	2.7_{bd}	7.63**	.10
Similarity	$.8_{a}$	1.1	1.1	1.4_{a}	2.53*	.03

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$
a-d Means with same subscript for a given strategy are significantly different, $p < .05$.